



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/980,854	12/07/2001	Eckhard Konig	42592	3591

7590 02/26/2004

Mark S Bicks
Roylance Abrams Berdo & Goodman
Suite 600
1300 19th Street NW
Washington, DC 20036

EXAMINER

PHAN, THIEM D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3729

DATE MAILED: 02/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/980, 854

Applicant(s)

KONIG, ECKHARD

Examiner

Tim Phan

Art Unit

3729

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 11 February 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: None.

Claim(s) objected to: None.

Claim(s) rejected: 11-18.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of 2. NOTE:

Applicant's remarks filed on January 30th and February 11th 2003 re traversing Claim 1(sic) and dependent Claims 12-18 are hold not to be persuasive for the following reasons:

Applicant recites inter alia "... formed by the dividing of the carrier body ..." (Cf. Claim 11, lines 11 & 12); this amended claim presents a new issue requiring further consideration and search, since the amended coating step (Cf. Claim 11, line 11) is performed with a further limitation on the "segment support parts formed by the dividing carrier body" in lieu of coating all the segment support parts as claimed in Paper filed August 28th 2003.

Applicant's remarks "... the Garlach (sic) patent does not anticipate or render obvious a currentless deposition of the coating ..." (Cf. Remarks filed January 30th 2004, page 6, line 16) and "... the Gerlach patent in fact teaches away from the use of such currentless disposition" (Cf. Remarks filed February 11th 2004, page 2, line 11), the Gerlach (US 5,157,299) hereinafter '299 teaches the protective coating by a plastic material (Cf. Column 2, lines 15 & 16) which is well known in the art to be a currentless deposition or coating.

Inherently the '299 teaches electroless deposition. This holding is beyond possibilities. It is almost a certainty. Where and how would one apply "plastics" electrolytically ?

Subsequent dependent claims continue to be rejected as stated in Paper filed November 6th 2003.

Furthermore, the Patent Office saith not..

TP


CARL J. ARBES
PRIMARY EXAMINER